DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 612 SO 023 658

AUTHOR Rimmerman, Craig A.
TITLE AIDS and Community Action: Developing a Pedagogical Strategy.
PUB DATE Sep 93
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Washington, DC, September 2-5, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome; *Citizen Participation; *Citizenship Education; *Community Action; Controversial Issues (Course Content); Curriculum Development; Higher Education; Political Science; *Public Policy; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an overview and critique of a team taught, senior level, interdisciplinary college course entitled "AIDS: Challenges and Crises." The details of the course and its underlying rationale are outlined. The paper concludes with a curriculum proposal rooted in the idea of critical education for citizenship. Those who teach political science in higher education can best achieve educational goals by utilizing critical education for citizenship. A course fitting this model would have the following characteristics: (1) be interdisciplinary in nature; (2) focus on public policy concerns and allow students to see the importance of participating in public decisions; (3) ask educators and students to conceive of democracy broadly to include community discussions, community action, public service, and protest politics; (4) ask students to conceptualize participation broadly to include workplace and community opportunities for participation; (5) encourage students to take into account the important relationships among gender, race, and class concerns in the participatory process; and (6) ask students to confront their assumptions regarding power and leadership as well as the sources of such assumptions. The specific course described focuses on the formulation of and responses to AIDS within three communities, the global, U.S. policy, and the art and theater communities. The curriculum proposal was intended to develop a course that allowed students to link learning outside the classroom in the form of community action or service with learning inside the classroom through reading and discussion rooted in the connection between democratic theory and democratic practice as reflected in timely public policy issues. (DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 365 612

AIDS and Community Action: Developing a Pedagogical Strategy

by

Craig A. Rimmerman
Associate Professor of Political Science
Hobart and William Smith Colleges
Geneva, New York 14456

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CRAIG A. RIMMERMAN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Paper prepared for presentation at the American Political Science Association's Annual Meetings, September 2-5, 1993, Washington, D.C. Copyright by the American Political Science Association

SO 023 658

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I. INTRODUCTION

It is indeed ironic that at the very moment that Eastern Europe is celebrating a transition to a Western-style democracy, we in the United States are becoming increasingly critical of our own. Two recent books, E.J. Dionne's Why Americans Hate Politics and William Greider's Who Will Tell the People, do a superb job in highlighting what Greider calls the betrayal of American democracy. A broad level of citizen disaffection with American politics was measured by the Harwood group study, Citizens and Politics: A View From Main Street America, prepared for the Kettering Foundation in 1991. The Harwood group found that Americans do care about politics, but they do not believe that their political participation can have a meaningful effect. Furthermore, their study revealed that citizens believe that they are politically impotent and are cut off from most policy issues given the way they are framed and represented in public discourse. Finally, the Harwood research indicates that citizens believe that many of the avenues open to them for expressing their views are mere window dressing, not serious attempts to hear the public. They believe they can be heard only when they organize into large groups and angrily protest policy decisions.

For those of us in higher education, it seems to me that we are uniquely situated to evaluate citizen disaffection and to devise pedagogical strategies rooted in a curriculum that enables our students to grapple with the meaning of citizenship, democracy, and public participation in compelling ways. Political scientists have much to offer as we tackle these issues in our teaching, our research, and in our community work. We can best achieve our educational goals by pursuing a model of education that I might call critical education for citizenship. A course rooted in critical education for citizenship should have the following characteristics: 1) it should be interdisciplinary in nature; 2) it should focus on public policy concerns and allow students to see the importance of participating in public decisions; 3) it should ask educators and students to conceive of democracy broadly to include community discussions, community action, public service, and protest politics; 4) it should ask students to conceptualize participation very broadly to include workplace and community opportunities for participation; 5) it should encourage students to take into account the important relationship among gender, race, and class concerns in the participatory process; 6) it should ask students to confront their assumptions regarding power and leadership as well as the sources of such assumptions (Rimmerman, 1993, chapter 6).

This paper provides an overview and critique of a team-taught, senior level, interdisciplinary course entitled "AIDS: Challenges and Crises," taught at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in fall 1991. The details of the course and its underlying rationale are outlined. The paper concludes with a

curriculum proposal rooted in the above critical education for citizenship notion, one that reflects the experience of teaching the AIDS course. My hope is that the proposal is informed by the best of what our course had to offer while minimizing its weaknesses.

PART II. "AIDS: CHALLENGES AND CRISES:" AN OVERVIEW AND CRITIQUE OF THE COURSE

The course was designed within the rubric of the senior level forum requirement that existed at Hobart and William Smith Colleges from 1989 through 1991. The goal of the senior forum was to ask our students to cap off their general education requirements by taking a senior level course that would require them to address a value laden issue from ethical, moral, and global perspectives. Other senior level forum offerings included "The Me Generation," "Arts and Society," "The Nuclear Predicament," "Israel and Palestine," "With an Eye on Nature," and "Science and Society." Class size ranged anywhere from 60 to 120 students.

The content and the structure of our Forum emerged from dialogues between students and faculty members in the spring before the fall course and among the faculty members through the summer. As a result of these conversations, the following course focus emerged: the formulation of and responses to AIDS within three communities, the global, U.S. policy, and the art and theatre communities. This focus surely reflected the teaching and research interests of the three faculty: Manisha Desai (a sociologist who studies gender from a global perspective); Robert Gross (an English professor and our Theater Director who teaches courses addressing the role of literature and drama in the larger society); and Craig Rimmerman (a political scientist who studies the capacity of the American policy process to respond to citizen action).

Students participated actively in the creation of this course. We held five planning sessions during the spring before the fall course and asked students to offer suggestions for the course structure, readings, guest speakers, assignments, and the nature of a proposed community project. The course originated when I went to a meeting of students who invited me to attend a planning session for Hobart and William Smith's AIDS awareness week. Students attending that meeting wanted to know what courses would be addressing AIDS in the upcoming school year. I was persuaded at that time that a senior AIDS forum would fill an important curricular void.

The idea of a Community Action Project requirement grew out of the course planning process. Students indicated that they wanted an opportunity to share what they were learning about AIDS with the larger Hobart and William Smith and Geneva, New York

communities. We agreed that all students would be required to participate in such a project in order to receive credit for the course. We also agreed, however, that the projects would not be graded. Students were encouraged to work in groups, although they were not required to do so. The term community "action" was adopted after many of our students involved in the course planning were concerned that a "community service" project would establish a clientele relationship between community members rooted in elitism and paternalism.

The Community Action Project requirement produced a number of interesting projects. Several students wrote a play called Just Words, which was designed to make us use more sensitive language when discussing AIDS; the play was performed in the student theater before a large audience. Another group devised an AIDS education strategy for use in the residence halls. Two students performed a dance in the student cafe on a Friday evening in honor of those living with AIDS and those who have died of AIDS. A large group of students put together an art show relecting on issues discussed in the course. The exhibit was later shown in a local library. Students also organized a condom distribution day where they distributed AIDS fact sheets along with condoms on campus.

The course was, however, fraught with implementation problems. All three instructors were struck by the fact that many of our students knew very little about the topic, despite the enormous amount of material regarding AIDS available for public consumption at the time. Some had previous AIDS courses and they were at an advantage compared to the 75-80 percent who had no courses at all. Coming into the course, for example, many students did not even know the distinction between being HIV positive and having full-blown AIDS. Moreover, they had been subjected to ten years of popular culture and media socialization around this issue and this meant that much of the course was devoted to deconstructing the assumptions that students brought to our classroom. What this meant in practice was that our students thought of AIDS as largely a gay disease, one that could not possibly affect upper middle class whites such as themselves.

We also found it difficult to encourage students to make the crucial and required link between theory and practice in any discussion of AIDS. A significant number of our students wanted to talk about feelings and emotions to the great consternation of the three faculty members. Throughout the course, the faculty continually sought to provide analytical frameworks developed in our respective disciplines and critical evaluative schema for evaluating society's response to AIDS. Many of our students did not want to analyze, instead they wished to focus on the emotional aspects of AIDS. In the planning process, students informed us that they wanted someone with AIDS to speak to the class. To these students, it was vital that someone with AIDS

have an opportunity to share his/her "experiences" with the class. The three faculty found this particularly distressing and tried to combat this emphasis on "emotions" and "feelings" during the course of the term. In retrospect, this student interest may well have been built into a course that deals with issues of sexuality and death, powerful, powerful issues that I had never before confronted before in ten years of college level teaching.

From my vantage point, the most valuable part of our course was the community action project. This is not to suggest that all students took the community action requirement seriously, for some students merely went through the motions in meeting our minimal course requirement. For example, a few students allowed others in their groups to do most of the work associated with their respective community projects. The projects were not graded and as a result, we had no clear way of rewarding those who took the project seriously.

My experience teaching in this AIDS course suggests that the community action requirements should not only have been required, but they should have been graded and made a more central component of the course requirements. As faculty, we should have worked more closely with students in developing the projects in more mature ways. Some students naturally developed creative and thoughtful projects with little faculty consultation. Other students, however, were completely lost and had no idea how to inform the broader community about AIDS.

With the above in mind, I submitted a curricular proposal to a Hobart and William Smith faculty curriculum planning committee in March 1993. My proposal was informed by my experience teaching in the AIDS course, my grappling with broader issues of democracy and citizenship as a teacher and as a scholar, as well as my work with the Kettering Foundation over the past seven years. The curriculum proposal follows with a discussion of its rationale.

PART III. CURRICULAR PROPOSAL: "COMMUNITY ACTION, PEDAGOGY, AND CRITICAL EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP"

Overview: The central goal of this curricular proposal is to develop a course (or courses) that will allow students to link learning outside the classroom in the form of community action (or community service depending on how the program is structured) with learning inside the classroom (reading and discussion rooted in the connection between democratic theory and democratic practice as reflected in timely public policy issues such as AIDS, housing, health care, education and literacy, the environment, etc.). Ideally, such a course would be a part of the general curriculum, would be interdisciplinary in character, and would involve more than one faculty member in the planning and actual teaching of the course. Students would also

participate in the course planning process. By its very nature, such a course would contribute to the surrounding Geneva community as well as enrich our lives at Hobart and William Smith Colleges by addressing contemporary public policy concerns and linking such concerns to democratic theory and practice. Ultimately, students, faculty, and members of the surrounding community would have an opportunity to address this important question: what is the mission of education in a democracy? Students would have an opportunity to address this important question from a number of different intellectual traditions.

Key Questions to be Addressed in the Curricular Planning Process:
In a recent PS article, Benjamin Barber and Richard Battistoni suggest that the curricular process for courses in community service/community action must address the following questions (Barber and Battistoni, p. 236):

1) Should service be education-based or extracurricular?
2) Should it be mandatory or voluntary?
3) Should it be civic or philanthropic?
4) Should it be for credit or not?
5) Should it be offered as a single course or as a multi-course program?
6) Should the community be a "client" or a "partner in education?"
7) Should students serve in group teams or as individuals?
8) Should the faculty also do community service?
9) Should the pedagogy of service emphasize patriotism and citizenship or critical thinking?
10) Should students participate in the planning process? If so, how?

I have addtiional questions that are particularly germane to the Hobart and William Smith educational experience:

11) How might we measure and evaluate community service learning? What empirical criteria might we use? Why use those criteria?

12) What are the weaknesses of structuring a curriculum rooted in "community service" per se? Should students be encouraged to participate in public politics, actually solving public problems, as well? Might this be a worthwhile substitute for traditional notions of community service?

13) To what extent are there community learning based opportunities in Geneva? What are the limitations of Geneva for such a program? Would we want students to explore community based learning opportunities in other areas (Ithaca, Rochester, Syracuse, for example, as well)? How would students be transported to/from such opportunities?

14) What would be the precise connection between community based

learning and what goes on in the classroom? How would the readings intersect with community based learning? Would the class be lecture, discussion formats, or both?

15) Would we want members of the surrounding community to visit our classrooms and offer their insights regarding how our students are interacting in the community? How might community members' classroom participation contribute to the learning process?

16) What is the relationship between community based learning and our liberal arts curriculum? To what extent might this notion of community learning tie into citizenship education? Just what do we mean by citizenship education? What are some of the various intellectual approaches to education for citizenship? In what ways can they be incorporated in the curricular structure?

An Attempt to Address Some of the Above Questions

A Johnson grant would allow interested members of the Hobart and William Smith community to come together to discuss what a community based curriculum might look like in practice. I think it would also be useful to invite faculty from other colleges and universities who have worked to devise curriculum addressing some of the above concerns (Benjamin Barber, Rutgers University; Richard Battistoni, Rutgers University and Baylor University; Mary Stanley, Syracuse University; Richard Battistoni, Rutgers University and Baylor University; Mary Stanley, Syracuse University; Leslie Hill, Bates College; Harry Boyte, University of Minnesota). As a part of this proposal, however, I would like to share some of my initial thoughts in respose to some of the above questions. Since 1987, I have worked as a consultant for the Kettering Foundation and met almost yearly with college faculty, administrators, and community activists around the country to tackle questions growing out of devising an appropriate pedagogy for courses rooted in citizenship and democracy. My thoughts grow out of these conversations, my participation in the fall 1991 AIDS senior forum, and articles/papers that I have written through the years:

1) My sense is that we need to provide our students with an opportunity to engage in curricular-based community education. I suspect that such a program will be an asset for admissions as well. The Clinton administration is very much committed to the idea (indeed, on the campaign trail, when then candidate Clinton discussed national service, he received very enthusiastic responses) and it should only grow in popularity over the next few years. We already have a successful Literacy Corps. program and Service Network club established. It seems to me that we need to build on these efforts and offer students the opportunity to take a course or courses rooted in community based learning.

2) The community based component would be required of any student who is enrolled in the course. I realize that requiring students to engage in community based opportunities is a controversial notion (my libertarian friends would surely be up in arms), but students could choose not to enroll in courses that had this requirement. This is not meant to be a requirement for all Hobart and William Smith students.

3) As outlined by Barber and Battistoni, there are two distinctive justifications for service learning--the civic and the philanthropic. "The philanthropic view emphasizes service as an exercise in altruism" while "the civic view, on the other hand, emphasizes mutual responsibility and the interdependence of rights and responsibilities, and it focuses not on altruism but on enlightened self-interest." From my vantage point, the civic view offers more of an opportunity for students to link democratic theory concerns with democratic practice. Both approaches, with a discussion of the strengths and limitations of each, would certainly need to be discussed during the curricular planning process and within the context of the classroom.

4) Yes, I think that if this proposal is to be taken seriously, we must show our commitment to developing a course or courses that have community based education as a requirement for credit.

5) Depending on faculty and student interest, this proposal can surely serve as the basis for a multi-course program that cuts across a variety of departments and programs.

6) Once again, the strengths and weaknesses of each approach would need to be discussed in the planning process as well as in the classroom. From my vantage point, there are many advantages to be gained from structuring the program in such a way that the community is a "partner in education."

7) I like the idea of group teams, but such teams would need to be structured carefully. The advantages and disadvantages of the "group" versus the "individual" approach and the broader consequences for democratic.theory and practice could be discussed in the course planning and classroom experience.

8) Barber and Battistoni's response to the notion of faculty actually doing community service is particularly relevant here:

> It seems obvious that where faculty teaching the classroom component of a service learning course also do service in common with the students, the impact is greatest. However, it is also true that the university teaches and requires of its students many things that it does not ask faculty to do. In the area of community service, the reasons for linkage

> are obvious, but it may put an undue burden on the recruitment of faculty to a program many see as alien and few feel trained or competent to teach in to start with. It would be nice if everyone--especially teachers--practiced all they preached, but the value of the practice is not attenuated by the incapacity of all of its teachers to live their teachings" (p. 238).

I agree with the Barber and Battistoni analysis here.

9) The structure of the pedagogy will be determined in the course planning process. It seems to me, however, that students need to see the link among developing critical thinking, speaking, and writing skills, citizenship, and democratic practice.

10) Students can potentially learn so much from helping to plan a course. As a faculty member, I know that I learned a great deal working with students in the planning of the AIDS senior forum. My hope is that students would be involved in the course planning process. The precise role that students would play needs to be articulated clearly. This could be done when faculty come together to discuss an appropriate pedagogy associated with such a course or courses.

11) The evaluation of community service learning is addressed in the next major section of this proposal.

12) Harry Boyte, the founder and director of Project Public Life at the Hubert Humphrey School of Public Policy at the University of Minnesota, is a thoughtful critic of community service based curricula. Boyte contends that if students are to engage in civic education, they need to be involved directly in the politics of public problem-solving. Boyte says it this way:

> Yet there is another current of citizenship education that I am convinced is more fruitful for teaching the active, multi-dimensional understanding of public agency needed in our time. This is the civic education that takes place when people learn the politics of public problem-solving, defined as the give-and-take, messy, everyday activity in which citizens set about dealing with the general issues of their public worlds (Boyte, 1992, p. 5).

Boyte's notion of establishing "free spaces," where students can participate in public politics deserves considerable attention in the course planning process. I am particularly interested in knowing whether such student participation opportunities would

present themselves readily in Geneva.

13) The issue of whether there are enough community based learning opportunities in the Geneva area would have to be addressed in the curricular planning process. Ithaca, Rochester, and Syracuse provide abundant opportunities, but logistical transportation problems need to be addressed.

14) Ideally, the classroom would be an opportunity where various intellectual approaches to civic education could be addressed. Readings assigned could reflect the different approaches. I would hope that students would have opportunity to confront the classical liberal critique of requiring community based service projects as a part of any college curricula. In addition, if courses are organized around specific policy areas (AIDS or literacy, for example), students would read relevant public policy literature. One goal might be for students to link their course readings, classroom discussions, and community based projects in ways that asks them to confront their roles as democratic citizens. The actual structure of individual courses would be devised by the teaching faculty and students.

15) I know that Professor Mary Stanley (Syracuse University) has taught community service courses where members of the community participated in several classroom discussions with participating students and faculty. The purpose of their participation would need to be identified and how it relates to learning assessed.

16) The relationship among community based participation, learning, and liberal arts education is of crucial importance as this curriculum is developed. To me, a liberal arts setting such as ours, should encourage faculty to develop pedagogical strategies that enable our students to grapple with the meaning of citizenship, democracy, and public participation in compelling ways. I view this curriculum proposal as contributing to this important goal.

<u>The Improvement of Learning and How to Assess It</u>

This proposal is rooted in the assumption that we, as faculty, need to afford our students an opportunity to take more direct links between the kind of learning that occurs in the Hobart and William Smith classroom and its connection to the surrounding community in which we live and work. We already have an excellent Student Literacy Corps., which might serve as a framework for the kind of student community participation that is a central goal of this proposal. The key, however, is to devise a pedagogical strategy that will enable students to link their readings, writing of papers, and discussions with their community participation within the context of the classroom. We might assess the improvement of learning in several ways:

a) ask students to keep daily journals where they are required to make important connections between their community participation and the course readings and discussions;

b) have faculty interviews with students in order to ascertain the kind of learning that is actually taking place over the course of the term;

c) invite members of the community who are working with our students to participate in classroom discussions with the idea that they would share their insights regarding the kind of learning taking place;

d) ask students to write papers early in the course where they outline their community participation expectations and then require students to reflect on their experiences in a final course paper by grounding their conclusions in the course reading, discussion, and lecture materials.

Community Action House

I hope that we can also discuss how the above goals might be incorporated in Hobart and William Smith's residence halls as well. One way would be to have a community action or service co-op where a small group of undergraduate students participating in civic education/participation courses would live together. Rutgers University has established a campus residence hall of this nature. Students are chosen based on thgeir commitments to community service and learning about democracy. According to a Rutgers University report, "the residents learn civic skills through their experience in the House, actively participating in creating the rules and making decisions about matters of common concern" (Civic Education and Community Service Program, 1993, p. 3). Students have enthusiastically supported the Hobart and William Smith co-op residence hall program through the years. I hope that we can explore the possibility of establishing a co-op house in conjunction with this curriculum (much like the Writers' House and Environmental Studies House).

PART IV. CONCLUSION

In his recent book An Aristocracy of Everyone, Benjamin Barber concludes correctly that "the successful resuscitation of the idea of service will not proceed far without the refurbishing of the theory and practice of democratic citizenship, which must in turn become any successful service program's guiding spirit" (Barber, 1992, p. 236). In embracing Barber's notion, this paper has attempted to link critical education for citizenship with community service. Whether active notions of democracy, the public, and citizenship can actually be enhanced through requiring students to engage in community service remains to be seen. The central weakness of the AIDS course is that it failed to develop a theoretical framework for the community action project requirement as fully as it might have. My hope is that the curricular proposal I have developed makes the important and

required link between theories of democracy and citizenship and community service. Indeed, we should celebrate the strengths of various approaches to citizenship education and allow them to inform us as we develop a critical pedagogy, a pedagogy that we will need to challenge the prevailing passivity of our time.

References

Barber, Benjamin. An Aristocracy of Everyone. New York: Ballantine, 1992.

Barber, Benjamin and Richard Battistoni. "A Season of Learning: Introducing Service Learning into the Liberal Arts Curriculum," PS: Political Science and Politics 26(2), June 1993, 235-240.

Boyte, Harry C. "Citizenship Education and the Public World," The Civic Arts Review 5(4), Fall 1992, 4-9.

"Citizens and Politics: A View from Main Street America," The Kettering Foundation, 1991.

"Civic Education and Community Service Program," Rutgers University.

Dionne, Jr., E.J. Why Americans Hate Politics. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991.

Greider, William. Who Will Tell the People: The Betrayal of American Democracy. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992.

Rimmerman, Craig A. Presidency by Plebiscite: The Reagan-Bush Era in Institutional Perspective. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1993.

A.I.D.S: CRISES AND CHALLENGES (Senior Forum 508)

Instructors:	Manisha Desai	Robert Gross	Craig Rimmerman
Offices:	Trinity 301	Coxe 6	Trinity 201
Tele. Nos:	3445	3990	3435
Office Hrs:	T,Th Noon-1pm W,F 4-5pm	T,Th 11-1pm	T,Th 11-Noon Wed. 1:30-4pm

All three instructors will have office hours at the Cafe on Tuesdays from noon-1pm. You can also meet them by appointment.

The content and the structure of this Forum emerged from dialogues between students and faculty members last Spring and among the faculty members through the summer. The focus of the course will be the formulation of and responses to A.I.D.S within three communities, the global, U.S. policy, and the art and theatre communities. Our aim will be understand the multifaceted relationships between social constructions and political action within each of these communities. Our explorations of this issue will be facilitated by books, films, and guest speakers.

To encourage active learning and the full participation of everyone, the Forum will be structured as follows:
(1) There will be lectures by each of the three faculty members at various points during the term (all students will attend in common at the Sanford Room).
(2) The class will be divided into three discussion sections which will meet at the assigned times every Tuesday and Thursday (1:30-3:15) in three different classrooms (Merritt 5, 101, & 202). Two groups of students in each section will be responsible for leading the discussion on any particular day (indicated on the syllabus as student discussion). The three faculty members will rotate among the three sections.
(3) In addition to the above sessions, the three faculty members will together host discussion sessions (indicated on the syllabus as faculty discussion). Attendance at these sessions is recommended but not required.
(4) We will meet several times in the evenings to view films and listen to guest speakers.
(5) We will meet together during the last two weeks for student presentations and panel discussions.

Requirements:

Texts:

Panos Dossier 1989 AIDS and the Third World
Richard & Rosalind Chirimuuta 1989 AIDS, Africa and Racism
ACT UP/NY 1990 Women, AIDS, & Activism
Douglas Crimp & Adam Rolston 1990 AIDS DEMOGRAPHICS
Nancy McKenzie (ed) 1991 The AIDS Reader
Charles Perrow & Mauro Guillen 1990 The AIDS Disaster
Paul Monette 1988 Borrowed Time: An AIDS Memoir

Texts (contd)

M. Elizabeth Osborn (ed) 1990 The Way We Live Now: American Plays & the AIDS Crisis

Films:

Reframing AIDS (Sept. 26 in class)
Stop The Church (Oct. 2, 7:00pm Sanford Room)
Common Threads (Oct. 30, 7:00pm Sanford Room)

Guest Speakers:

1) Prof. David Craig, Sept. 12 in class

2) Ms. Belinda Rochelle (National Gay & Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute and the AIDS Action Council), Sept. 25, 8:00pm Geneva Room

3) Ms. Stacey Young, Ithaca ACT/UP activist, Oct. 10 in class

4) Prof. John Arras (Montefiore Medical Center, New York), Nov. 5 in class

You are also recommended to attend the speakers sponsored by the Wellness Program on Campus. They will be on campus at the following times:

Ms. Linda Dimitroff, Health Education/AIDS Specialist, Sept. 17, Tuesday 8-9:30 pm, Wasey Room

Mr. Bruce Rooney, Health Education/Dept. of Social Work, Decatur, Georgia, Oct. 17, Thursday 8-9:30pm, Geneva Room

Attendance is expected at all class sessions and evening events.

Written Assignments:

(1) There will be four 2 page papers, including one on the community action project (each paper is worth 10% of the final grade--40% total). The papers are due Sept. 10, Sept. 24, Oct. 8, and Oct. 22.
(2) All students will be required to facilitate a class discussion. Students will submit a one page planning paper related to facilitation (together worth 20%).
(3) Students will also write a fifteen page term paper (worth 40%). A one page proposal of the term paper will be required at midterm - Oct. 17.

In the interest of equity and fairness to all students, all assignments are due at the beginning of the class on the assigned dates. There will be no extensions except for medical emergency.

Presentations:

All students will make a 10-minute presentation on their community action projects in the last week of classes. These can be group or individual presentations.

If you feel that you cannot live with the above requirements, you should probably consider enrolling in another senior forum.

Tentative Course Outline

Week 1

Sept. 5 Th. Introduction

Discourses on AIDS
Week 2

Sept. 10 Tu Faculty Discussion (Sanford Rm)
Readings: Way We Live Now, pp 129-135
The AIDS Reader, pp 113-121
AIDS, Africa & Racism, Chs 1 & 4

PAPER 1 DUE (on any one of the readings)

Sept. 12 Th Guest Speaker: Prof. Craig
Readings: The AIDS Reader, pp 74-103

Global and Gender Issues in AIDS
Week 3

Sept. 17 Tu Prof. Desai
Readings: AIDS and The Third World, Chs 4-8

Sept. 19 Th Student Discussion
Readings: AIDS, Africe & Racism, Chs 8 -13

Week 4

Sept. 24 Tu Student Discussion (meet in respective sections)
Readings: Women, AIDS, & Activism, pp 81-116 & pp 211-240

SECOND PAPER DUE

Sept. 25 W Guest Speaker: Belinda Rochelle
8:00pm Geneva Room

Sept. 26 Th **Film:** Reframing AIDS (Sanford Rm)
Student Discussion (meet in respective sections)

Readings: AIDS Disaster, Chs 1-4

Week 5

Oct 1 Tu — Faculty Discussion (Sanford Rm)
Readings: AIDS Reader, pp 220-246, pp 247-263, and pp 273-284

Oct. 2 W — **Film: Stop the Church at 7:00 pm Sanford Rm**

Political Action and the American Policy Response

Oct 3 Th — Prof. Rimmerman
Readings: Complete The AIDS Disaster
Begin AIDS DEMOGRAPHICS

Week 6

Oct 8 Tu — Student Discussion (meet in respective sections)
Readings: AIDS Reader, pp 497-503, pp 505-521, pp 522-526, pp 463-485
Complete AIDS DEMOGRAPHICS

THIRD PAPER DUE

Oct 10 Th — Guest Speakers: Stacey Young & ACT UP Activists

Week 7

Oct 15 Tu — Student Discussion (meet in respective sections)

AIDS and the Arts

Oct 17 Th — Faculty Discussion (meet in Sanford Room)
Readings: Borrowed Time

TERM PAPER PROPOSAL DUE

Week 8

Oct 22 Tu — Prof. Gross
Readings: The Way We Live Now, pp 99-128, & 3-62

COMMUNITY ACTION PROPOSAL DUE

Oct 24 Th — Discussion
Readings: The Way We Live Now, pp 205-279

Week 9

Oct 29 Tu — Student Discussion (meet in respective sections)
Readings: Vision of Love Revealed in Sleep (on reserve)

Oct. 30 W — **Film: Common Threads, 7:00pm Sanford Rm**

Oct 31 Th	Faculty Discussion (Sanford Rm)
Week 10	
Nov 5 Tu	Guest Speaker: Prof. John Arras (Sanford Rm) Readings: "The Fragile Web of Responsibility: AIDS and the Duty to Treat." On Reserve
Nov 7 Th	Faculty Discussion (Sanford Rm)
Nov. 6-8	Plays: Jack and The Way We Live Now
Week 11	
Nov 12 Tu	Community Action Presentations
Nov 14 Th	Community Action Presentations
Week 12	
Nov. 19	Panel Discussions
	TERM PAPER DUE